

- 1 Popul Ecol
- 2 **Can widespread generalist predators affect keystone prey? A case study with red**
- 3 **foxes and European rabbits in their native range**
- 4 Javier Fernandez-de-Simon • Francisco Díaz-Ruiz • Manuel Rodríguez-de la Cruz •
- 5 Miguel Delibes-Mateos • Rafael Villafuerte • Pablo Ferreras
- 6
- 7 Javier Fernandez-de-Simon • Francisco Díaz-Ruiz • Manuel Rodríguez-de la Cruz •
- 8 Miguel Delibes-Mateos • Rafael Villafuerte • Pablo Ferreras
- 9 Instituto de Investigación en Recursos Cinegéticos, IREC (CSIC-UCLM-JCCM),
- 10 Ronda de Toledo nº 12, 13071, Ciudad Real, Spain.
- 11
- 12 Javier Fernandez-de-Simon
- 13 Laboratoire Chrono-Environnement
- 14 UMR UFC/CNRS 6249 INRA, Université de Franche-Comté,
- 15 16 Route de Gray, 25030 Besançon CEDEX, France
- 16
- 17 Miguel Delibes-Mateos • Rafael Villafuerte
- 18 Instituto de Estudios Sociales Avanzados, IESA (CSIC), C/ Campo Santo de los
- 19 Mártires, 7, 14004, Córdoba, Spain
- 20
- 21 Miguel Delibes-Mateos • Francisco Díaz-Ruiz
- 22 CIBIO/InBIO, Universidade do Porto, Campus de Vairao 4485-661, Vairao Vila do
- 23 Conde, Portugal
- 24

25 Correspondence: J. Fernandez-de-Simon, Calatrava 20, 3º-C, Ciudad Real, Spain.

26 Phone: +34665849411. Email: [jafdsr@yahoo.es](mailto:jafdsr@yahoo.es)

27

28 Number of text pages: 29

29 Number of Figures: 6

30 Number of Tables: 3

31 Number of Electronic Supplementary Materials: 1

## Abstract

Widespread generalist predators may affect declining keystone prey populations. However, this phenomenon is not well understood. In this paper, we assessed whether the abundance and population growth of European rabbits *Oryctolagus cuniculus*, a keystone prey species in Mediterranean Iberia, was related to the abundance and diet of red foxes, *Vulpes vulpes*, a widespread generalist predator. In a locality in central Spain, where rabbit population abundance declined, we estimated rabbit abundance during almost three years and determined fox abundance and diet during two overlapping years. We calculated a fox predation index (percentage of consumed rabbit biomass  $\times$  fox abundance) to assess the importance of rabbits to foxes. We employed a multi-model approach to explain rabbit abundance and population growth. Foxes consumed between 60 and 99 % rabbit biomass in their diets, and this was independent of rabbit abundance. Periods of higher fox predation index coincided with lower rabbit density and vice versa. Two models best explained rabbit abundance and four rabbit population growth. They included the fox predation index and its interaction with rabbit abundance during the previous month. Altogether, fox predation, intraspecific density dependence, and their interaction partly explained rabbit population dynamics. We conclude that in order to propel the recovery of the rabbit in Iberia, it is essential to better understand the role of these factors in driving the abundance of the species.

## Keywords

- 55 Diet · Intraspecific density dependence · *Oryctolagus cuniculus* · Predator control · Prey
- 56 limitation · *Vulpes vulpes*

## Introduction

The European rabbit (*Oryctolagus cuniculus* L.), a lagomorph native to the Iberian Peninsula, is the most preferred prey of foxes (*Vulpes vulpes* L.) in central–southern Iberia (Díaz–Ruiz et al. 2013). Rabbits are the main prey item for foxes and other predators because of its considerable size and usual high abundance (Delibes and Hiraldo 1981; Ferrer and Negro 2004; Delibes–Mateos et al. 2008a). Rabbits in this part of the world are thus considered a keystone species i.e., a species that maintains the structure and integrity of the community, and is therefore a species of high conservation concern (Delibes–Mateos et al. 2007; Wagner 2012). Rabbits create open areas, promote soil fertility and increase plant growth and diversity (Gómez–Sal et al. 1999; Willot et al. 2000). In addition, rabbit latrines provide food for many invertebrates (Verdú and Galante 2004) and rabbit burrows provide nest sites and shelter for vertebrates and invertebrates (Gálvez et al. 2009). The rabbit is also of high economic importance in Iberia since it is one of the most hunted small game species in Spain and Portugal (Delibes–Mateos et al. 2008a).

In recent decades, most Iberian rabbit populations have decreased drastically due to the impact of viral diseases such as myxomatosis and rabbit hemorrhagic disease (hereafter RHD), alongside with habitat loss and overhunting (Delibes–Mateos et al. 2009). Because of these declines, the rabbit is now classified as a “Vulnerable” species in the Spanish Red List (Villafuerte and Delibes–Mateos 2007). Understanding which factors may hinder the recovery of the rabbit in the Iberian Peninsula, is crucial to propose mitigating actions (Delibes–Mateos et al. 2009, 2014a). In particular, assessing

the role of predators on rabbit populations is fundamental given that predation is one of the main processes structuring animal communities (Sinclair and Krebs 2002).

Predation effects on a prey species are often difficult to quantify (Valkama et al. 2005), and predation consequences on ecosystem functioning are often not well understood. However, baseline information on predator abundance and prey consumption can be used to quantify predation intensity (Korpimäki et al. 1991), and the relationship between predation intensity, prey abundance and its population growth employed to estimate the effects of predation on a prey (Sinclair et al. 1998, 2006).

Here, we assessed whether predation by the main predator of the rabbit in Iberia, the red fox, was related to the abundance and population growth of the rabbit populations in a locality in central Spain.

The red fox is considered to be one of the most widespread generalist vertebrate predators in the world (Macdonald and Reynolds 2004). Red foxes are known to limit prey abundance, especially when prey populations are already declining or at low densities (Saunders et al. 2010). Studies demonstrating fox effects on rabbit abundance were mostly from Australia where rabbits were introduced and are considered pests (Pech et al. 1992; Banks 2000). In Iberia, however, foxes are often assumed to affect the abundance and population growth of rabbit populations (Villafuerte et al. 1996; Calzada 2000; Delibes–Mateos et al. 2008b), though there is no empirical data to adequately demonstrate this. In central Spain, most small game hunters argue that foxes negatively impact rabbits and partridges; hence foxes are often controlled in hunting estates (Delibes–Mateos et al. 2013). But, the effects of fox predation on Iberian rabbit population dynamics are not well understood (Norbury and Jones 2015), with no

evidence that rabbit populations increase with fox control (Díaz–Ruiz and Ferreras 2013).

In this paper, we first examine rabbit consumption by foxes and estimated fox abundance changes in a locality where an overall decline in rabbit abundance had been recorded for a three–year period. We also employed a smaller concurrent two–year dataset, to analyse and discuss the potential role of fox predation on the rabbit population. Finally, we discuss how our results can be utilised to better understand predator–prey relationships in a context of biodiversity conservation.

## **Materials and methods**

### **Study area**

We carried out our fieldwork in a property located in the Albacete province (central Spain, Fig. 1). The climate is Mediterranean, characterized by mild wet winters and warm dry summers. The landscape is typical of most rural Mediterranean areas (Blondel and Aronson 1999) occupied by Mediterranean scrubland (e.g., with rosemary *Rosmarinus officinalis* L., kermes oaks *Quercus coccifera* L., thyme *Thymus* sp.), pastures (mainly grasses), ‘dehesas’ (savanna–like formations combining pasture with intermittent cereal cultivation in park–like woodlands of mainly oaks *Quercus ilex* ssp. *rotundifolia* Lam., Blondel and Aronson 1999), and croplands (mainly cereals and vineyards *Vitis vinifera* L.). Besides agriculture, other sources of income included horse breeding and hunting of small game, such as rabbits. During the study, a gamekeeper was employed in the property except for the last months, who was responsible for regulating hunting and controlling predators. Predator control is generally undertaken in

a non-systematic way in small game hunting estates (Delibes-Mateos et al. 2013) and unfortunately, for our study site no data on the intensity of fox control was available.

Because our study locality contained gentle slopes and ecotones between Mediterranean scrubland areas and pastures or cropland, it was highly favorable for rabbits and foxes (Lombardi et al. 2003; Macdonald and Reynolds 2004). Highest rabbit densities were usually found along the ecotones between open scrub and cereal crops; areas of softer soil of greater ease for building rabbit warrens. Rabbit densities in the study area ranged from low to high densities for Iberia (Fernandez-de-Simon et al. 2011a; Delibes-Mateos et al. 2014b). Fox abundance was considered as very low to intermediate for this region (see Results; Sobrino et al. 2009; Fernandez-de-Simon 2013).

#### Rabbit and fox abundance estimation

To estimate rabbit abundance we conducted cleared-plot pellet counts during a period of three years (summer 2006–summer 2009). Cleared-plot pellet counts is a cost-efficient method that is widely used in rabbit studies; it provides one of the most reliable estimates of rabbit abundance (Fernandez-de-Simon et al. 2011a, b; Ferreira et al. 2014). Within a  $40 \times 70$  m grid, we set 40 circular ( $0.5 \text{ m}^2$ ) plots distributed regularly in the area with the highest rabbit abundance that was accessible to foxes living in the surroundings (see below, Fig. 1). Every month, we obtained a pellet count index corrected for pellet persistence (hereafter  $N$ , pellets  $\text{m}^{-2} \text{ day}^{-1}$ ; see Fernandez-de-Simon et al. 2011a, b). We also calculated the monthly rabbit population growth by using  $N$  from consecutive months (Sinclair et al. 2006) as follows:



$$NPGI = (\log(N_t/N_{t-1})/T) \times 30.42$$

where  $T$  is the number of days between visits and 30.42 is the average length of a calendar month in days.

To estimate fox abundance, we conducted spotlight counts along a 15-km–transect driven at night, starting at least one hour after sunset. Surveys were undertaken for three consecutive nights, unless prevented by meteorological conditions or logistic constraints. Our fox transect was as close as 300 m from the rabbit abundance sampling grid (Fig. 1) to allow us to detect changes in fox abundance that may prey upon our monitored rabbit population. To account for seasonal changes in fox densities (Reynolds and Tapper 1995), we conducted spotlight count surveys twice a year: in winter–spring (March–May), and in summer (July) during 2007–2009. We used the mean number of individual red foxes seen per km and night in each period as a red fox abundance index (hereafter  $RF$ , Pech et al. 1992; Sobrino et al. 2009).

#### Fox diet assessment

We examined changes in fox diet during a two-year period (March 2007–June 2009) from scats collected along transects (2.4–9.0 km long) walked every month (Fig. 1). Transects, though not standardised, traversed land features (e.g., tracks, paved roads, water streams, fences, rabbit warrens, etc.; Webbon et al. 2004) where foxes regularly deposited scats during territory marking. Fox scats were identified by their scent, size, shape, thickness and by the presence of fox hairs, which appear in scats because of

grooming (Delibes–Mateos et al. 2008c and references therein). We analyzed a total of 342 fox scats. In April 2007, December 2007 and March 2009 no scats were collected due to logistic constraints. In our analyses we excluded May 2009, since fewer than 5 scats were available for that month. For the remaining months, at least 5 scats were available for analysis (Fig. S1 in Electronic Supplementary Material (ESM)); this sample size was considered adequate since only a small number of food items were consumed (mainly rabbits, see below, Table 1).

Scats were dried at 60 °C for a period of 48 h and then weighted to the nearest 0.001 g using a digital scale. The scats were then soaked overnight in water, after which we teased them apart over a 0.5 mm sieve (Reynolds and Aebischer 1991). We classified remains found in each scat into 10 food classes: a) rabbit, b) hare, c) undetermined lagomorph, d) small mammals, e) carrion (wild ungulates, livestock and mammalian carnivores), f) birds and eggs, g) reptiles and amphibians, h) arthropods, i) fruits and seeds, and j) others (rare items or impossible to determine). The dry weight of the remains of each food class in each scat was estimated as the product of the percent volume of each prey item and the scat's dry weight (Delibes–Mateos et al. 2008c). We calculated the consumed biomass of each item by multiplying the dry weight of the item in the scats by the coefficient of digestibility specific to the food class. The latter is the ratio of the fresh ingested food /dry weight of the scats produced (Reynolds and Aebischer 1991), obtained from 10–day food trials using two captive red foxes (one male, one female) at the IREC–UCLM experimental facility (Table 1, Fernandez–de–Simon 2013). For arthropods, and reptiles/amphibians, we used the coefficients of digestibility reported by Reynolds and Tapper (1995) and Sarmiento (1996), respectively. To assess the contribution made by rabbit to fox diet during each month,

we estimated the percentage of rabbit biomass consumed. We also calculated a monthly rabbit predation index (hereafter  $PI$ ) as the product of monthly rabbit consumption (percentage of consumed rabbit biomass) and the fox abundance index ( $RF$ , see also Korpimäki et al. 1991). We derived a winter  $RF$  for the period December–May, and summer  $RF$  for the period June–November.

## Data analyses

To understand the feeding ecology of the fox in our study locality, we first investigated the relationship between the percentage of rabbit biomass consumed and rabbit abundance. We then assessed the relationship between the predation index,  $RFI_t$  (see above) and rabbit abundance index ( $N_t$ ) and rabbit population growth ( $NPG_t$ ). Given the time series for rabbit abundance spanned from August 2006 to June 2009, but data of  $RF$  (and thus  $RFI$ ) was collected between April 2007 and May 2009, our analyses only refer to the overlap period of two years. We developed general linear models for (a)  $N_t$  and (b)  $NPG_t$  as dependent variables. We considered (i)  $RFI_t$ , (ii) month, (iii) year, and (iv) the interaction  $N_{t-1} \times RFI_t$  as independent variables. All models included  $N_{t-1}$  to correct potential temporal autocorrelation. We also run a model with  $N_{t-1}$  only to test whether previous abundance of rabbits alone could also explain rabbit abundance and population growth. In addition, we compared the performance of these models with a null model (intercept only) as an indicator of overall model performance (Burnham and Anderson 2002). In total, 17 models were generated with all possible variable combinations. Models were fitted with a normal error distribution and an identity link. For model selection we inspected mainly the AIC<sub>c</sub> (Akaike Information Criterion

corrected for small sample size), but also  $D^2$  (explained deviance). Given the large number of models tested, we only show those models within  $\Delta_i < 2$  ( $\Delta_i$  = difference in AIC<sub>c</sub> with the most parsimonious model). We tested normality, linearity and homocedasticity of model residuals and variables used (Zuur et al. 2007). To meet model assumptions, we transformed, when necessary, either the dependent and/or independent variables with the decimal logarithm transformation (see Zuur et al. 2007). We also tested temporal autocorrelation by a linear model of the consecutive residuals against each other (Breusch–Godfrey test for autocorrelation, Godfrey 1978; Breusch 1979). However, we did not find evidence of temporal autocorrelation. We show parameters and probability values of individual variables in the best models but we did not set a critical probability threshold since we were more interested in inference than in hypothesis testing. Thus, we even considered models with non-significant variables ( $P > 0.05$ ), as they were included for inference purposes (Burnham and Anderson 2002). We performed these analyses using R version 3.0.1 (R Development Core Team 2013).

## Results

Rabbit abundance decreased along three years with maximum in September 2006 ( $N = 3.53$  pellets  $\text{m}^{-2} \text{day}^{-1}$ ) and minimum in March and April 2009 ( $N = 0.22$  pellets  $\text{m}^{-2} \text{day}^{-1}$ , Fig. 2).

Rabbits were the main prey item consumed by foxes in our study area (Table 1). Monthly rabbit consumption by foxes ranged between 60 and 99 % in biomass terms, and varied independently of rabbit abundance (Fig. 3).

Fox abundance also varied across time, with a minimum in winter–spring 2008, with no foxes observed, to a maximum in winter–spring 2009 ( $RF = 0.13$  foxes  $\text{km}^{-1}$ , Fig. 4). Predation Index was lowest during winter–spring 2008 ( $RFI = 0.00$  percentage of rabbit biomass  $\times$  foxes  $\text{km}^{-1}$ ), and highest in winter–spring 2009 ( $RFI = 11.53$  percentage of rabbit biomass  $\times$  foxes  $\text{km}^{-1}$ ). Predation index was inversely related to rabbit abundance for the overlap period (Fig. 2, see below).

Two models explaining rabbit abundance ( $\log N_t$ ) had  $\Delta_i < 2$ ; these included  $RFI_t$  (Fig. 5) and the interaction  $\log N_{t-1} \times RFI_t$  (Tables 2 and 3). Four rabbit population growth models also had  $\Delta_i < 2$ , that included the variable  $N_{t-1}$  (log–transformed, Fig. 6),  $RFI_t$  and the interaction  $\log N_{t-1} \times RFI_t$  (Tables 2 and 3).

## Discussion

Fox predation was related to the decline in rabbit abundance along the two years we were able to obtain simultaneous data on foxes and rabbits. This is in agreement with previous studies conducted in Australia (Pech et al. 1992; Banks 2000), which showed the fox predation had a severe impact on dwindling rabbit populations. In Iberia, Calzada (2000) suggested that foxes could limit and regulate rabbit numbers at low densities within Doñana National Park (SW Spain). In central–southern Spain, Delibes–Mateos et al. (2008b) showed that the removal of foxes was the main management practice that positively contributed to rabbit population change (but see Díaz–Ruiz and Ferreras 2013; Norbury and Jones 2015). Our work here suggests, more specifically, a close relationship between rabbit population trends and fox predation. To our knowledge, this is the first study conducted in the rabbit’s native range that takes into

account fox abundance and this species' diet to measure the impact of fox predation on rabbit abundance and population growth. Although our study was conducted at only one location, this site is potentially representative of many areas in central Iberian Peninsula (e.g., hunting estates of low-to-high rabbit densities, where predator control is carried out, and with other economic activities like agriculture, small game hunting or animal production).

Our findings indicate that despite the fact that foxes are considered generalist predators capable of consuming a wide range of food items (Macdonald and Reynolds 2004), they may also specialize on more abundant prey items. This has been demonstrated for other parts of the Iberian Peninsula where rabbits are moderately abundant (Díaz-Ruiz et al. 2013). In our study, we showed that high rabbit consumption by foxes occurred independently of rabbit abundance; thus the observed lack of variation in rabbit consumption in our study may indicate that, under the estimated rabbit abundance, foxes specialize on rabbits (Delibes-Mateos et al. 2008c).

We showed that rabbit population growth was negatively related to the previous month's rabbit abundance. This suggests that rabbit populations may be limited by intraspecific density dependence (Ruiz-Azpurua et al. 2014). The growth of rabbit populations observed at low rabbit densities (Fig. 6) could be explained by a lower intraspecific competition (Ruiz-Azpurua et al. 2014), which favours exploitation of the resources available in these situations (Sinclair and Krebs 2002; Sinclair et al. 2006). In addition, the interaction between fox predation index and previous month rabbit abundance was included in the models that best explained rabbit population growth. Fox predation at lower rabbit abundance may produce a higher proportional loss in the rabbit

population and potentially regulate it, in contrast to what has been observed at higher densities (Pech et al. 1992; Norbury and Jones 2015).

Other factors could also explain the observed rabbit population trends (e.g., diseases, food scarcity or absence of refuges; Moreno et al. 2007; Delibes–Mateos et al. 2014a; Ferreira et al. 2014). For instance, rabbit hunting was carried out in our study site and, apart from the rabbit mortality imposed by hunters and effects on rabbit population trends (Williams et al. 2007; but see Delibes–Mateos et al. 2008b), this practice may also force rabbits to become more nocturnal (J. Fernandez–de–Simon et al., unpublished data). As a consequence, it may also allow higher rabbit availability at night, and thus may attract nocturnal predators like foxes (Reynolds and Tapper 1995), potentially with an increase in fox abundance and pressure. Other studies could further assert our findings for other parts of the rabbit’s range (see e.g., experimental approaches in Pech et al. 1992; Tapper et al. 1996; Allen and Leung 2014; Allen et al. 2014).

In conclusion, we have shown the potential role of fox predation on rabbit abundance and population growth in the Iberian portion of the Mediterranean hotspot. It is essential to increase the understanding of this and other factors driving the abundance of European wild rabbit populations in Iberia, as recovering this keystone species is among the most challenging ecological problems for biodiversity conservation in this region.

## **Acknowledgments and Compliance with Ethical Standards**

This is a partial result from the I+D National Plan Projects CGL2005–02340 and CGL2009–10741, funded by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation and EU FEDER funds. JFdS benefitted from a FPI PhD scholarship (BES–2006–12562) funded by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation and the European Social Fund. J. Fernandez–de–Simon and F. Díaz–Ruiz are currently holding a postdoctoral fellowship from Junta de Castilla–La Mancha and the European Social Fund. M. Delibes–Mateos is currently funded by Junta de Andalucía and the EU FP7, under grant agreement 267226. The authors had the necessary licences and permits (dated 1 February 2004) for the activities described in the paper and took into account the welfare of animals. We are indebted to landowners and personnel of the study area. We thank many people who kindly collaborated with us. Prof. J. E. Fa carefully revised the English text. In addition, F.S. Tortosa, F. Cirilli, B. Arroyo, M. Delibes, P.C. Alves, C. Johnson, B. Allen, T. Saitoh, and three anonymous reviewers provided helpful suggestions in earlier drafts of the manuscript.



## References

- Allen BL, Leung LK–P (2014) The (non)effects of lethal population control on the diet of Australian dingoes. *PLoS One* 9(9):e108251
- Allen BL, Allen LR, Engeman RM, Leung LK–P (2014) Sympatric prey responses to lethal top–predator control: predator manipulation experiments. *Frontiers in Zoology* 11:56
- Banks PB (2000) Can foxes regulate rabbit populations? *J Wildl Manage* 64:401–406
- Blondel J, Aronson J (1999) *Biology and wildlife of the Mediterranean region*. Oxford University Press, Oxford
- Breusch TS (1979) Testing for autocorrelation in dynamic linear models. *Australian Economic Papers* 17:334–355
- Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2002) *Model selection and multimodel inference: a practical information–theoretic approach*, 2nd edn. Springer, New York
- Calzada J (2000) *Impacto de la depredación y selección de presa del lince y el zorro sobre el conejo*. PhD Thesis, Universidad de León, León (**in Spanish**)
- Delibes M, Hiraldo F (1981) The rabbit as prey in the Iberian Mediterranean ecosystem. In: Myers K, MacInnes CD (eds) *Proceedings of the World Lagomorph Conference*. University of Guelph, Guelph, pp 614–622
- Delibes–Mateos M, Redpath SM, Angulo E, Ferreras P, Villafuerte R (2007) Rabbits as a keystone species in southern Europe. *Biol Conserv* 137:149–156
- Delibes–Mateos M, Delibes M, Ferreras P, Villafuerte R (2008a) Key role of European rabbits in the conservation of the western Mediterranean basin hotspot. *Conserv Biol* 22:1106–1117

356 Delibes–Mateos M, Ferreras P, Villafuerte R (2008b) Rabbit populations and game  
 357 management: the situation after 15 years of rabbit haemorrhagic disease in  
 358 central–southern Spain. *Biodivers Conserv* 17:559–574  
 359 Delibes–Mateos M, Fernandez–de–Simon J, Ferreras P, Villafuerte R (2008c) Feeding  
 360 responses of the red fox (*Vulpes vulpes*) to different wild rabbit (*Oryctolagus*  
 361 *cuniculus*) densities: a regional approach. *Eur J Wildlife Res* 54:71–78  
 362 Delibes–Mateos M, Ferreras P, Villafuerte R (2009) European rabbit population trends  
 363 and associated factors: a review of the situation in the Iberian Peninsula.  
 364 *Mammal Rev* 39:124–140  
 365 Delibes–Mateos M, Díaz–Fernández S, Ferreras P, Viñuela J, Arroyo B (2013) The role  
 366 of economic and social factors driving predator control in small game estates in  
 367 central Spain. *Ecol Soc* 18(2):28  
 368 Delibes–Mateos M, Ferreira C, Carro F, Escudero MA, Gortázar C (2014a) Ecosystem  
 369 effects of variant rabbit hemorrhagic disease virus, Iberian Peninsula. *Emerg*  
 370 *Infect Dis* 20:2166–2168  
 371 Delibes–Mateos M, Ferreira C, Rouco C, Villafuerte R, Barrio IC (2014b)  
 372 Conservationists, hunters and farmers: the European rabbit *Oryctolagus*  
 373 *cuniculus* management conflict in the Iberian peninsula. *Mammal Rev* 44:190–  
 374 203  
 375 Díaz–Ruiz F, Ferreras P (2013) Conocimiento científico sobre la gestión de  
 376 depredadores generalistas en España: el caso del zorro (*Vulpes vulpes*) y la  
 377 urraca (*Pica pica*). *Ecosistemas* 22:40–47 (**in Spanish with English abstract**)  
 378 Díaz–Ruiz F, Delibes–Mateos M, García–Moreno JL, López–Martín JM, Ferreira C,  
 379 Ferreras P (2013) Biogeographical patterns in the diet of an opportunistic

380 predator: the red fox *Vulpes vulpes* in the Iberian peninsula. Mammal Rev  
 381 43:59–70  
 382 Fernandez–de–Simon J (2013) Predation and the recovery of European rabbit  
 383 populations in central–southern Iberian peninsula. An assessment of the predator  
 384 pit hypothesis. PhD Thesis, Universidad de Castilla–La Mancha, Ciudad Real  
 385 Fernandez–de–Simon J, Díaz–Ruiz F, Cirilli F, Tortosa FS, Villafuerte R, Delibes–  
 386 Mateos M, Ferreras P (2011a) Towards a standardized index of European rabbit  
 387 abundance in Iberian Mediterranean habitats. Eur J Wildlife Res 57:1091–1100  
 388 Fernandez–de–Simon J, Díaz–Ruiz F, Villafuerte R, Delibes–Mateos M, Ferreras P  
 389 (2011b) Assessing predictors of pellet persistence in European rabbits  
 390 *Oryctolagus cuniculus*: towards reliable population estimates from pellet counts.  
 391 Wildlife Biol 17:317–325  
 392 Ferreira C, Touza J, Rouco C, Díaz–Ruiz F, Fernandez–de–Simon J, Ríos–Saldaña CA,  
 393 Ferreras P, Villafuerte R, Delibes–Mateos M (2014) Habitat management as a  
 394 generalized tool to boost European rabbit *Oryctolagus cuniculus* populations in  
 395 the Iberian peninsula: a cost–effectiveness analysis. Mammal Rev 44:30–43  
 396 Ferrer M, Negro JJ (2004) The near extinction of two large European predators: super  
 397 specialists pay a price. Conserv Biol 18:344–349  
 398 Gálvez L, Belliure J, Rebollo S (2009) European rabbits as ecosystem engineers:  
 399 warrens increase lizard density and diversity. Biodivers Conserv 18:869–885  
 400 Godfrey LG (1978) Testing against general autoregressive and moving average error  
 401 models when the regressors include lagged dependent variables. Econometrica  
 402 46:1293–1302

403 Gómez–Sal A, Rey–Benayas JM, López–Pintor A, Rebollo S (1999) Role of  
 404 disturbance in maintaining a savanna–like pattern in Mediterranean *Retama*  
 405 *sphaerocarpa* shrubland. J Veg Sci 10:365–370  
 406 Korpimäki E, Norrdahl K, Rinta–Jaskari T (1991) Responses of stoats and least weasels  
 407 to fluctuating food abundances: is the low phase of the vole cycle due to  
 408 mustelid predation? Oecologia 88:552–561  
 409 Lombardi L, Fernández N, Moreno S, Villafuerte R (2003) Habitat–related differences  
 410 in rabbit (*Oryctolagus cuniculus*) abundance, distribution, and activity. J  
 411 Mammal 84:26–36  
 412 Macdonald DW, Reynolds JC (2004) Red fox *Vulpes vulpes* Linnaeus, 1758. In:  
 413 Sillero–Zubiri C, Hoffmann M, Macdonald DW (eds) Canids: foxes, wolves,  
 414 jackals and dogs. Status survey and conservation action plan. IUCN/SSC Canid  
 415 Specialist Group, Gland and Cambridge, pp 129–136  
 416 Moreno S, Beltrán JF, Cotilla I, Kuffner B, Laffite R, Jordán G, Ayala J, Quintero C,  
 417 Jiménez A, Castro F, Cabezas S, Villafuerte R (2007) Long–term decline of the  
 418 European wild rabbit (*Oryctolagus cuniculus*) in south–western Spain. Wildl  
 419 Res 34:652–658  
 420 Norbury G, Jones C (2015) Pests controlling pests: does predator control lead to greater  
 421 European rabbit abundance in Australasia? Mammal Rev 45:79–87  
 422 Pech RP, Sinclair ARE, Newsome AE, Catling PC (1992) Limits to predator regulation  
 423 of rabbits in Australia: evidence from predator–removal experiments. Oecologia  
 424 89:102–112  
 425 R Development Core Team (2013) R: A language and environment for statistical  
 426 computing. Austria R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna

- 427 Reynolds J, Aebischer N (1991) Comparison and quantification of carnivore diet by  
 428 faecal analysis: a critique with recommendations based on a study of the fox  
 429 *Vulpes vulpes*. Mammal Rev 21:97–122
- 430 Reynolds JC, Tapper SC (1995) The ecology of the red fox *Vulpes vulpes* in relation to  
 431 small game in rural southern England. Wildlife Biol 1:105–119
- 432 Ruiz–Azpurua L, Guerrero–Casado J, Carpio AJ, Tortosa FS (2014) High rabbit  
 433 abundance proves detrimental to the population growth rate in European rabbit  
 434 (*Oryctolagus cuniculus* L.) extensive breeding enclosures. World Rabbit Science  
 435 22:179–186
- 436 Sarmento P (1996) Feeding ecology of the European wildcat *Felis silvestris* in Portugal.  
 437 Acta Theriol 41:409–414
- 438 Saunders G, Gentle MN, Dickman CR (2010) The impacts and management of foxes  
 439 *Vulpes vulpes* in Australia. Mammal Rev 40:181–211
- 440 Sinclair ARE, Krebs CJ (2002) Complex numerical responses to top–down and bottom–  
 441 up processes in vertebrate populations. Philos Trans R Soc B–Biol Sci  
 442 357:1221–1231
- 443 Sinclair ARE, Pech RP, Dickman CR, Hik D, Mahon P, Newsome AE (1998)  
 444 Predicting effects of predation on conservation of endangered prey. Conserv  
 445 Biol 12:564–575
- 446 Sinclair ARE, Fryxell JM, Caughley G (2006) Wildlife ecology, conservation, and  
 447 management. 2nd edn. Blackwell, Oxford
- 448 Sobrino R, Acevedo P, Escudero MA, Marco J, Gortázar C (2009) Carnivore population  
 449 trends in Spanish agrosystems after the reduction in food availability due to

450 rabbit decline by rabbit haemorrhagic disease and improved waste management.  
 451 Eur J Wildlife Res 55:161–165  
 452 Tapper SC, Potts GR, Brockless MH (1996) The effect of an experimental reduction in  
 453 predation pressure on the breeding success and population density of grey  
 454 partridges *Perdix perdix*. J Appl Ecol 33:965–978  
 455 Valkama J, Korpimäki E, Arroyo B, Beja P, Bretagnolle V, Bro E, Kenward R, Mañosa  
 456 S, Redpath SM, Thirgood S, Viñuela J (2005) Birds of prey as limiting factors of  
 457 gamebird populations in Europe: a review. Biol Rev 80:171–203  
 458 Verdú JR, Galante E (2004) Behavioural and morphological adaptations for a low–  
 459 quality resource in semi–arid environments: dung beetles (Coleoptera,  
 460 Scarabaeoidea) associated with the European rabbit (*Oryctolagus cuniculus* L.).  
 461 J Nat Hist 38:705–715  
 462 Villafuerte R, Delibes–Mateos M (2007) *Oryctolagus cuniculus* (Linnaeus, 1758). In:  
 463 Palomo LJ, Gisbert J, Blanco JC (eds) Atlas y libro rojo de los mamíferos  
 464 terrestres de España. Dirección General para la Biodiversidad–SECEM–  
 465 SECEMU, Madrid, pp 490–491 (**in Spanish**)  
 466 Villafuerte R, Luco DF, Gortázar C, Blanco JC (1996) Effect on red fox litter size and  
 467 diet after rabbit haemorrhagic disease in north–eastern Spain. J Zool 240:764–  
 468 767  
 469 Wagner SC (2012) Keystone species. Nature Education Knowledge 3(10):51  
 470 Webbon C, Baker P, Harris S (2004) Faecal density counts for monitoring changes in  
 471 red fox numbers in rural Britain. J Appl Ecol 41:768–779

472 Williams D, Acevedo P, Gortázar C, Escudero MA, Labarta JL, Marco J, Villafuerte R  
473 (2007) Hunting for answers: rabbit (*Oryctolagus cuniculus*) population trends in  
474 northeastern Spain. Eur J Wildlife Res 53:19–28

475 Willot SJ, Miller AJ, Incoll LD, Compton SG (2000) The contribution of rabbits  
476 (*Oryctolagus cuniculus* L.) to soil fertility in semi–arid Spain. Biology and  
477 Fertility of Soils 31:379–384

478 Zuur AF, Ieno EN, Smith GM (2007) Analysing ecological data. Springer, New York  
479

## Tables

**Table 1** Red fox diet (percentage of dry weight and percentage of biomass) estimated in a locality monitored monthly in central Spain between March 2007 and June 2009 by means of the analysis of 342 scats. The coefficients of digestibility (fresh ingested food /dry weight of the scats produced), used to obtain biomass consumption estimates from scat analyses are also shown. These coefficients were estimated from feeding tests with captive foxes, except those with a superscript for which bibliographic values were employed. See text for further details.

Food class	Percentage of dry weight	Percentage of biomass	Coefficients of digestibility
European rabbit	85.63	83.24	16.00
Iberian hare	1.69	2.02	19.70
Undetermined lagomorph	0.05	0.05	17.85 <sup>a</sup>
Small mammals	2.06	2.08	16.60
Carrion	< 0.01	< 0.01	37.20
Birds/Eggs	5.35	6.58	20.25
Reptiles/Amphibians	0.25	0.49	32.10 <sup>b</sup>
Arthropods	3.31	2.49	12.40 <sup>c</sup>
Fruits/Seeds	1.65	2.99	29.80
Others	0.02	0.03	23.74 <sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Average from European rabbits and Iberian hare coefficients of digestibility, from authors' data.



- 492   <sup>b</sup> Average from Sarmiento (1996) “lizards” and “snakes” coefficients of digestibility.
- 493   <sup>c</sup> From Reynolds and Tapper (1995).
- 494   <sup>d</sup> Average from the coefficients of digestibility of undetermined lagomorph, small
- 495   mammals, carrion, birds/eggs, reptiles/amphibians, arthropods, and fruits/seeds.

**Table 2** Models explaining rabbit abundance ( $\log N_t$ ) and rabbit monthly population growth ( $NPG_t$ ) in the study locality.  $RFI_t$  is the red fox predation index and  $\log N_{t-1}$  is the previous month rabbit abundance. The models with  $\Delta_i < 2$  are shown and labelled with numbers between parenthesis (1–6, see Table 3). See also text for further details.

Dependent variable	Model and independent variables	$K$	$AIC_c$	$\Delta_i$	$D^2$
$\log N_t$	(1) $\log N_{t-1} + \log N_{t-1} \times RFI_t$	4	-54.71	0.00	0.47
	(2) $\log N_{t-1} + RFI_t$	4	-53.01	1.70	0.43
$NPG_t$	(3) $\log N_{t-1}$	3	25.82	0.00	0.33
	(4) $\log N_{t-1} + \log N_{t-1} \times RFI_t$	4	25.94	0.12	0.40
	(5) $\log N_{t-1} + RFI_t + \log N_{t-1} \times RFI_t$	5	26.91	1.09	0.46
	(6) $\log N_{t-1} + RFI_t$	4	27.41	1.59	0.36

**Table 3** Parameters of models explaining rabbit abundance ( $\log N_t$ ) and rabbit monthly population growth ( $NPG_t$ ) in the study locality.  $RFI_t$  is the red fox predation index and  $\log N_{t-1}$  is the previous month rabbit abundance. Models with  $\Delta_i < 2$  are shown. These models are labelled with numbers between parentheses corresponding to models shown in Table 2. See text for further details.

Model (1)		Coefficient	SE	<i>t</i>	<i>P</i>
$\log N_t$	Intercept	0.25	0.06	3.98	< 0.001
	$\log N_{t-1}$	0.27	0.19	1.42	0.170
	$\log N_{t-1} \times RFI_t$	− 0.06	0.02	−3.02	0.007
Model (2)					
$\log N_t$	Intercept	0.31	0.08	3.66	0.002
	$\log N_{t-1}$	0.08	0.24	0.35	0.731
	$RFI_t$	−0.01	0.01	−2.65	0.015
Model (3)					
$NPG_t$	Intercept	0.86	0.27	3.17	0.005
	$\log N_{t-1}$	−3.11	0.98	−3.19	0.004
Model (4)					
$NPG_t$	Intercept	1.21	0.34	3.57	0.002
	$\log N_{t-1}$	− 3.75	1.02	−3.68	0.002
	$\log N_{t-1} \times RFI_t$	− 0.17	0.10	−1.62	0.121
Model (5)					
$NPG_t$	Intercept	0.54	0.57	0.94	0.361
	$\log N_{t-1}$	−1.68	1.75	−0.96	0.350

	$PI_t$	0.13	0.09	1.43	0.170
	$\log N_{t-1} \times RFI_t$	-0.64	0.34	-1.85	0.080
Model (6)					
$NPG_t$	Intercept	1.25	0.45	2.80	0.011
	$\log N_{t-1}$	-4.03	1.28	-3.15	0.005
	$RFI_t$	-0.03	0.03	-1.11	0.281

509

510

## Figure legends

**Fig. 1** Location of the study area in central Spain. The transect for spotlight fox counts is depicted as a black thick line within this study area. The location of the sampling grid for cleared-plot rabbit pellet counts is shown as a dark grey point. The circle in light grey colour shows the area where red fox scats were collected during transects on foot.

**Fig. 2** Relative abundance of rabbits ( $N$ , pellets  $\text{m}^{-2} \text{day}^{-1}$ , thin line) and fox predation index ( $RFI$ , percentage of rabbit biomass  $\times$  foxes  $\text{km}^{-1}$ , thick line) in the study locality.


**Fig. 3** Percentage of rabbit biomass consumed by foxes at different relative abundance of rabbits ( $N_t$ , pellets  $\text{m}^{-2} \text{day}^{-1}$ ) in the study locality.

**Fig. 4** Temporal variation of the relative abundance of foxes ( $RF$ , foxes  $\text{km}^{-1}$ ) during the spotlighting periods in the study locality. Standard errors are shown as bars.

**Fig. 5** Graphical representation to explain the **logarithm of** relative abundance of rabbits ( $N_t$ , pellets  $\text{m}^{-2} \text{day}^{-1}$ ) which includes the fox predation index ( $RFI_t$ , percentage of rabbit biomass  $\times$  foxes  $\text{km}^{-1}$ ). See Tables 2 and 3 and text for further details.

**Fig. 6** Graphical representation to explain rabbit monthly population growth ( $NPG_t$ ) which includes the **logarithm** of the previous month relative abundance of rabbits ( $N_{t-1}$ , pellets  $\text{m}^{-2} \text{day}^{-1}$ ). See Tables 2 and 3 and text for further details.

Figure 1







Figure 2

Figure 3








Figure 4

Figure 5




Figure 6

